REMARKS

Claims 1-7, 10-12, 17 and 23-37 are pending in this application after this amendment. Claims 1, 23 and 27 are independent. Claims 8-9, 13-16 and 18-22 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer to the subject matter included therein. New claims 31-37 have been added. No new matter has been added by the addition of new claims 31-37. In light of the amendments and remarks made herein, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections.

By this amendment, Applicants have amended the claims to more appropriately recite the claimed invention. It is respectfully submitted that these amendments are being made without conceding the propriety of the Examiner's rejections, but merely to timely advance prosecution of the present application.

In the outstanding Official Action, the Examiner provisionally rejected claims 1-6 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-6 of co-pending Application No. 10/568,504; objected to the specification; rejected claims 1-18 under 35 U.S.C. §101; rejected claims 6 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph; rejected claims 1-2, 5, 16-17, 19-21, 23-24, and 27-28 under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by Baluja (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0149958); and rejected claims 3-4, 6-15, 18, 22, 25-26 and 29-30 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Baluja in view of Fam (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0181777). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Double Patenting Rejection

The Examiner rejected claims 1-6 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-6 of co-pending Application No. 10/568,504. By this amendment, without conceding the propriety of the Examiner's rejections, Applicants have amended the claims to more clearly recite the claimed invention. Based on the amendments made herein, Applicants respectfully request the outstanding rejection be withdrawn.

CMV/ta

Objection to Specification

The Examiner objected to the specification asserting the recitation of "research" should be "search". Applicants respectfully note that, according to the Merriam Webster dictionary, "research" is defined as a "careful or diligent search" or "the collecting of information about a particular subject." While Applicants appreciate the Examiner suggesting the term "search," Applicants respectfully submit that the term "research," as recited in the specification, is proper. As explained in the specification, for example, on page 13 in the first full paragraph, a researcher may perform research by moving to a designated point, while holding the device, and may provide input in accordance with the information displayed on the display of the terminal device.

As such, Applicants respectfully submit that the term "research" is proper and respectfully request the outstanding objection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §101

The Examiner rejected claims 1-18 asserting the claims merely recite software and are directed to a computer program, per se. While not conceding the propriety of the Examiner's rejections, by this amendment, Applicants have amended the claims to more clearly recite the claimed invention. Based on the amendments made herein, Applicants respectfully request the outstanding rejections be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §112

The Examiner rejected claim 6 asserting the claim fails to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject which applicant regards as the invention. While not conceding the propriety of the Examiner's rejections, by this amendment, Applicants have amended the claims to more clearly recite the claimed invention. Based on the amendments made herein, Applicants respectfully request the outstanding rejections be withdrawn.

With regard to the Examiner's rejection of claim 22, Applicants have canceled claim 22. As such, it is respectfully requested that the outstanding rejection be withdrawn.

CMV/ta

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102

By this amendment, Applicants have amended claim 1 to recite, *inter alia*,

an input screen information producing unit which produces information to form an input screen including a component setting region to accept information as a parameter required to form a component for forming a plurality of research item designating regions to display information representing said plurality of research items of said predetermined research content, and a research result input region in which said plurality of input interfaces are formed to input an answer to said plurality of research items, or a component for designating that said position information acquiring unit or said photograph unit of said mobile terminal device is used, said information being input by a user, a component adding operation button group to accept an instruction to add said component of a type selected from a plurality of types of said component by allowing said user to select a type suitable for said research item added to said work screen, said component adding operation button group being used in the case of adding said research item to said work screen, and a producing button to instruct that a source code is produced by using information required to form said components depending on said type which is input by said user operation, said plurality of research item designating regions and said research result input region being displayed on said work screen displayed on said display unit of said mobile terminal device when said mobile terminal device executes said research program, and which produces information to form said input screen in which each of said component setting region is formed to accept information as said parameter required to form said component depending on said selected type, said information being input by said user, every time said component adding operation button group is operated;

a parameter managing unit which manages information which is input by said user operation through said input screen displayed by said display process unit as a plurality of parameters to form said work screen, and which outputs said plurality of parameters required to form said plurality of components and input in said plurality of component setting regions corresponding to said plurality of research items formed in said input screen in association with respective type information which specifies said corresponding type of said plurality of said components when said producing button operation is accepted; and

an accepting unit which accepts an input of a parameter to create a program to realize a predetermined process, the parameter representing a question to be displayed on a display of a predetermined terminal device when the first program is executed.

In support of the Examiner's rejection of claim 1, the Examiner asserts that Baluja anticipates all of the claim elements. The disclosure of Baluja is directed to automatic code generation applications. Specifically, Baluja discloses in paragraphs [0077] as follows:

[0077] FIG. 6A is a flow diagram illustrating the process by which the code provider provides target code to an application developer. ... In block 601 the code

CMV/ta

provider accepts an **event to be logged** in the target application. In block 603 the code provider then determines the target language from the application developer. In block 605 the code provider **generates the code to monitor the event to be logged.** In block 607 the code provider generates the code which receives the event to be logged and writes it to the data log 307 (See FIG. 3). In block 609 the code provider generates the target code which creates the data log in the target application. If the data log is already present the block 609 may not be needed. If it is not known whether the data log is present the target code of the block 609 may include a code segment that tests for the presence of the data log and creates the data log if none is present. In block 611 the code provider provides the generated code to the application developer to insert into the target application.

As can be seen from the above disclosure, Baluja discloses a code provider generating a code to monitor an event, based on acceptance of an event to be logged. However, Applicants respectfully submit that the parameter of an "event to be logged," is insufficient to teach or suggest the claimed element of the "parameter" as defined in the claim. Specifically, Baluja fails to teach or suggest a component setting region to accept information as a parameter required for form a component for forming a plurality of research item designating regions to display information representing said plurality of research items of said research content. Further, Baluja fails to teach or suggest a parameter managing unit which manages information which is input by said user operation through said input screen displayed by said display process unit as a plurality of parameters to form said work screen. Still further, Baluja fails to teach or suggest a parameter managing unit which outputs said plurality of parameters required to form said plurality of components and input in said plurality of component setting regions corresponding to said plurality of research items formed in said input screen in association with respective type information which specifies said corresponding type of said plurality of said components when said producing button operation is accepted. Finally, Baluja fails to teach or suggest an accepting unit which accepts an input of a parameter to create a program to realize a predetermined process, the parameter representing a question to be displayed on a display of a predetermined terminal device when the first program is executed. For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 1 is not anticipated by Baluja. It is respectfully requested that the outstanding rejection be withdrawn.

It is respectfully submitted that claims 2-18 and 31-37 are allowable for the reasons set forth above with regard to claim 1 at least based on their dependency on claim 1. It is further

CMV/ta

respectfully submitted that claims 23 and 27 include at least one of the elements similar to those discussed above with regard to claim 1 and thus these claims, together with claims dependent thereon, are allowable for the reasons set forth above with regard to claim 1.

Conclusion

In view of the above amendment, Applicants believe the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Catherine M. Voisinet Reg. No. 52,327 at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: February 12, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By_____
Catherine M. Voisinet
Registration No.: 52,327
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicants

CMV/ta